Datums.com
Derivatives Ai Translations of Uploaded Multimedia Sources

Why We Must Stay Out of Iran

By Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr. January 19, 2026

Tension in Iran has increased recently, as economic woes and reactions against the Islamic regime in power have led to protests that have been met with violence and death inflicted by the forces in power. **Trump has threatened armed intervention** if the deaths continue. There is every reason to oppose this. But before getting into what might happen in Iran, there is another issue that we need to address, and this issue is basic.

The Principle of Non-Intervention

The purpose of American foreign policy is to **defend America from attack**. Iran poses no direct threat to America. We might prefer some outcomes of the situation there to others, but that does not justify a departure from our traditional foreign policy of **non-intervention**.

The late Murray Rothbard explained the reasons for non-intervention with unsurpassed clarity:

- "The basic element of any libertarian foreign policy is to pressure the government to do nothing abroad, just to pack up shop and go home".
- Rothbard recommended a constitutional amendment stating that "**no American soldier, plane, or ship shall be sent any place outside America**".
- Intervention leads to the killing of innocent civilians because all governments aggress against their citizens through taxes, conscription, and mass murder called war.
- The way to minimize aggression is to press for nobody to enter into any conflict at all.

Regional Influence and Israel

One key fact needs to be kept in mind: **Iran and Israel are bitter enemies**. The Israeli government of Benjamin Netanyahu would like nothing better than an American attack on Iran to overthrow its rival and remove an existential threat. Netanyahu has repeatedly urged America to attack.

Unfortunately, **Trump is often under Netanyahu's sway**. In a speech to the Knesset last October, Trump expressed gratitude for Netanyahu's "exceptional courage and patriotism" and noted that while he is "not the easiest guy to deal with," that is "what makes him great".

Military Options and Diplomatic Breakdown

The Pentagon is presenting a wider range of strike options to Trump than previously reported. These include:

- **Iran's nuclear program**, going beyond previous airstrikes.
- **Ballistic missile sites**.
- Narrower options such as a **cyberattack** or a strike against Iran's domestic security apparatus.

While White House press secretary Karoline Leavitt stated that "diplomacy is always the first option," direct contact between senior officials has reportedly broken down. Communications between Iranian Foreign Minister Abbas Araghchi and US special envoy Steve Witkoff have been suspended. Trump recently posted on social media that he has **cancelled all meetings** with Iranian officials until the killing of protesters stops, adding, "**HELP IS ON ITS WAY. MIGA!!!**".

The Argument for Intervention

Abe Greenwald, Executive Editor of *Commentary*, strongly supports intervention, arguing that Trump has traveled too far down the road to turn back. Greenwald believes an American military operation is **imminent** and could:

- Topple the world's largest supporter of terrorism.
- Liberate the Iranian people.
- Reverse the "default bipartisan reticence" over U.S. power projection.

Conclusion

Despite these arguments, we must do everything we can to **protest an American attack on Iran** and return to a foreign policy of non-intervention.

Clarification: This response formats the newly provided article regarding Iran. If you intended for me to re-format the previous text regarding the Department of Homeland Security and Minnesota (mentioned in the history and source), please let me know. Are you looking for a comparison between these two interventionist policies?